DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 692 FL 027 870

AUTHOR	Train, Robert W.
TITLE	The (Non)Native Standard Language in Foreign Language Education: A Critical Perspective.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	38p.; In: The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-Native, and the Non-Native Speaker. Issues in Language Program Direction, A Series of Annual Volumes; see FL 027 869.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Sociocultural Patterns; Cultural Awareness; Bilingualism; Cultural Influences; Elementary Secondary Education; French; *Heritage Education; Higher Education; Multilingualism; *Native Speakers; Second Language Instruction; Sociolinguistics; Spanish
IDENTIFIERS	*Heritage Language

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines the notion of (non)nativeness, central to foreign language (FL) education, in terms of an overarching ideology of standardization. It focuses on French and Spanish, because they are the two most commonly taught languages in North American FL classrooms and they have been seen to represent two seemingly diverse attitudes toward the construct of native standard language. The paper highlights the following: "The Native Standard Language: Linguistic Ideology and Sociocultural Practice"; "Normativity and Practices of Variation"; "Monolingual Exclusivity and Worldliness"; "Rethinking Language and Culture beyond the Native Standard" (from variation as problem to variation as a resource: toward a notion of bilingual, multilingual, and multicomponent expertise, and reimagining FL education as cross-cultural, multicultural, and sociocultural education); "Creating a Place for Critical Awareness of Language, Culture and Self in FL Education" (toward critical language awareness for students, and from critical language awareness to critical language teaching awareness); and "Socioculturality as the Core." (Contains 108 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 692

The (Non)Native Standard Language in Foreign Language Education: A Critical Perspective

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sara Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Robert W. Train
Somona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

There is a vast array of nomenclature used to describe programs dedicated to the study of the most widely taught non-English languages and literatures in North American schools, colleges, and universities. The canonical term is "foreign language(s)", a contrastive categorization (not native, other, not English) generally attached to discrete languages such as French, Spanish, Italian, German, or Chinese on the assumption of a privileged geographical origin in a nation-state. Some names incorporate broader continental or regional designations (e.g., European or Asian languages; Iberian languages), in addition to the universalizing "world" languages. Other appellations assume common cultural or ethnic heritage (e.g., Hispanic languages) and shared linguistic origins (e.g., Romance languages), as well as the contrastive "languages-other-than-English" and the periodizing "modern" versus "classical" languages. While this list is by no means exhaustive, it is interesting to note that the most sociolinguistically relevant term to describe these complex constructs of unity and differentiation in language education is absent: (non)native standard languages.

Perhaps the lack of explicit acknowledgement of the standard construct and its problematic nativeness is understandable given the fundamental role that nativeness and standardness have played in the construction of foreign language (FL) education—like the proverbial forest through which we can't see the trees. Perhaps the uncomfortable or even intractable nature of the issues raised by both these terms has limited or marginalized their place in the vibrant and sometimes heated debates among FL practitioners and researchers in the past

FL021810

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

several decades. However, members of the FL education community are beginning to formulate their critical responses to the problematic and contested issues associated with the teaching of a native standard language as a foreign language. It is in the spirit of contributing to a practical and theoretical discussion concerning the fundamental elements of our profession that I will outline the notion of (non)nativeness, central to FL education, in terms of an overarching ideology of standardization.

The substance of my position is that we recognize and critically examine the deep-seated standardness of the pedagogical constructs of language and culture that undergird the language teaching-learning endeavor in the classroom. A critical sociolinguistic and sociocultural perspective will promote a vision of language learning and teaching as a process of nurturing multilingual (Blyth 1995) and intercultural speakers (Byram and Zarate 1997; Kramsch 1998a) rather than the arguably unattainable goal of producing "native-like" speakers. Much of the important work thus far in challenging the idealized native speaker[1] has taken place with relatively little discussion of the standardization process that has created the dominant ideological construct of a native standard language.

A critical perspective on standardization is also useful in contextualizing foreign-language pedagogy within the broader educational system of which standard language is a central element. Therefore, I have chosen to focus on French and Spanish because they are the two most commonly taught languages in North American FL classrooms, and they have been seen to represent two seemingly diverse attitudes toward the construct of native standard language. For the teaching and learning of Spanish, it is necessary to recognize how the native standard constructions influence pedagogical practices and to question how "multicultural" and "intercultural" current approaches to Spanish actually are, and to what extent they contribute to the creation of workable notions of an intercultural and multicultural self in the learner within a global *Hispanidad* and in relation to the diversity of local and national communities. For the teaching and learning of French, the newly-emerging multiculturalism of the French class must be critically contextualized with respect to the native standard language ideology that has provided little space for the realization of socioculturally complex identities.

I will suggest some directions and dilemmas for FL education posed by the sociocultural construct of the native standard language in terms of linguistic ideology, sociolinguistic variation, intercultural and multicultural education, and critical language awareness.

The Native Standard Language: Linguistic Ideology and Sociocultural Practice

Sociolinguistics has posed the fundamental "problem" of the native standard language (NSL) in terms of the relationship between so-called artificial (i.e., imposed or engineered) constructs of the language and the reality of observable language use. Standard languages are the product of the standardization process and are therefore distinct from other linguistic varieties that have not undergone standardization.[2] The starting point of sociolinguistics is the concept of variation that attempts to both describe the basic heterogeneity of language and also problematize the linguistic "reality" of "the language" based on the homogeneous language of an idealized native standard speaker inhabiting a unitary community (see Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968). The disjunct between what is thought, or assumed, to be the language (that is, the NSL) and language practices as they can be observed in a variety of contexts has led to a multidisciplinary view of standard language as a linguistic ideology (Milroy and Milroy 1985) grounded in a linguistic culture (Schiffman 1996) with significant sociocultural, political and pedagogical implications. Speakers of standard languages can be said to live in "standard language cultures" in which certain languages, including English, French and Spanish, "are believed by their speakers to exist in standardized forms, and this kind of belief affects the way in which speakers think about their own language and about 'language' in general" (Milroy 2001, p. 530). The recognition that standard languages are constructed in terms of linguistic ideologies and sociocultural practices forms the basis of a critical perspective on language education in general and, in the present discussion, FL education in particular. This is not the place to examine language standardization in all its complexity. Instead, I will point out several features of the NSL construct in order to open the discussion as to how ideologies shape, reflect, and construct the sociocultural practices that have come to constitute the "reality" of language teachers and learners.

(Non)Nativeness: No One's Native Language and the Language of the Native Speaker

Following the sociolinguistic premise of artificiality, the standard language has been characterized as no one's native language insofar as it is a cultural endowment with functions that cannot be mastered until after the period of normal first-language acquisition (Joseph 1987, p. 17). Although no one's native language, the standard language comes to define in ideological terms the language of native speakers

with respect to what Benedict Anderson (1991) has called the "imagined communities" known as nations.[3] This ideologized nativeness, that is, the seemingly simple but highly problematic identity between one's native language-culture and the standard language, is at the heart of standardization.

Standardization is the process of language-making by which elite norms have come to define over time what constitutes "the language" of the nation, the empire, its citizens and its schools. The standardization process confers privileged native-speakership on the users of the standard language, which comes to be nativized as the putative native language of the educated members of society and becomes the universalized and essentialized hegemonic "unitary language" (Gramsci 1975; Crowley 1989) of the larger national and/or international community. In the case of Spanish, for example, the language practices of a geographically and socially situated group in Castile were codified (i.e., inscribed in grammars, dictionaries, orthographic rules, etc.), thus forming the basis of the universalized language of the kingdom and, later, the Spanish Empire. More recently, the polycentric standardization (Stewart 1968) of prestige norms in Spain and Latin America has come to define "the Spanish language" with respect to a constellation of standard language practices attached to national (e.g. Argentinean, Mexican) and international (e.g., American Hispanic) identities linked together by a notion of global *Hispanidad*.

The standardization process has taken on a life of its own in the recontextualization and systematization of the NSL construct as a pedagogical hyperstandard (Train 2000) for the purposes of teaching the language to non-native speakers. The codified formal and appropriate communicative elements in the foreign language (associated with a unitary foreign culture) constitute a set of pedagogical norms that represents "the language" and "the culture" in ways that are distanced from but related to the learners' existing language-culture practices as well as the actual language-culture practices of target language speakers.

The interplay between the linguistic ideology and the sociocultural reality of pedagogical practice is evident in what has probably always been the dominant assumption in foreign language instruction: a teachable language is a native standard language. The justification for the native speaker as a pedagogical construct resides in its social reality as an ideological construct of prestige and (in)equality grounded in language. The concern seems to be that language pedagogy must at all costs spare language learners from the stigmatized identity of nonnativeness by having an idealized native speaker proficiency as the ultimate goal.[4] The linguistic (in)security surrounding the standard

language is highly problematic given that it is not clear to what extent adherence to the native speaker norm protects learners from non-nativeness, particularly in light of what Davies (1991) has called "the paradox by which native speakers judge non-native speaker sociolinguistic deviance more critically as non-native speaker grammatical proficiency increases" (p. 166).

Normativity and Practices of Variation

Standard languages represent and construct a worldview of language, culture, and society in which variation is problematic. Standardization involves the "suppression of optional variability" in language (Milroy and Milroy 1985). On the one hand, the goal of standardization is to suppress present (or synchronic) and future (or diachronic) variability in a language. On the other hand, the standard language requires the existence of practices of variation (i.e., a wide range of language and culture practices from regionally- and socially-marked pronunciation to bilingual code switching) that in effect define standard practices with respect to non-standard ones. In other words, the standard defines variation and is also defined by variation. In this sense, the goal of standardization is not to eliminate or even purport to eliminate variability but to institutionalize a set of evaluative and affective stances toward practices of variation in opposition to a standardized language and its attendant culture. These perceptions or misperceptions of variability are operative on the level of individual and collective beliefs, motivations and attitudes, as well as on a policy level that influences political and educational decisions about language.

Attitudes and motivations must be understood in relation to the central, though often unacknowledged, role of language norms and standards in language instruction (McGroarty 1996, p. 4). The NSL represents institutionalized normativity (Bartsch 1987) involving evaluative judgments and affective stances toward language (e.g., clear/unclear, good/bad, correct/incorrect, acceptable/unacceptable, appropriate/inappropriate). This idealized and authoritative (see Bakhtin 1981) state of "the language" (e.g., *le français, le bon français, el castellano, el español, la norma culta*) implies the imposition of an idealized native speaker norm (e.g., the *bon usage/buen uso* of the educated speaker) as the normative center and the internalization or nativization by speakers of the social attitudes and affective stances attached to this norm. In this way, the standard language also constitutes a set of "common-sense" assumptions, myths (see Bauer and Trudgill 1998) and "folk beliefs" (see Preston 1998) that discourages any challenge to the legitimacy of "the language" construct.

The integrated normativity (i.e., both institutionalized and internalized, official and commonsensical) of the NSL is central to the pedagogical hyperstandard that assumes the acquiescence on the part of learners to acquire the native speaker norm. The language of the FL classroom represents a universalized native speaker norm (e.g., native French speaker, educated native speaker) that is almost entirely controlled by the educational institution through teachers, textbooks, ancillary instructional materials, and the like. Yet learners (with their highly variable language and learning practices) are expected to conform to and ideally internalize the norm based on relatively little linguistic input and in a relatively reduced range of settings in which the language is presented.[5] Whether learners can or want to acquire the native speaker norm is not generally taken into account according to the dominant ideology.

A related assumption is that linguistic and educational quality resides solely in the native speaker norm. Individual and collective attitudes as to the quality of the language (Eloy 1995; Heller 1999), the language learning experience (i.e., acquisition), and instructional practices of teaching the language (i.e., pedagogy) are based on the knowledge and use of standard language, such that the "successful" learners are those who have "mastered" the standard language. Given that mastery of the standard (with its assumed cultural capital) is unevenly distributed in society, the underlying tacit assumption is that quality is a function of linguistic and cultural inequality. In this sense, the notion of standard language is a sociocultural reaction to variation in language-culture practices attached to ideologically constructed categories in society (e.g., educated vs. uneducated; middle-class vs. working-class; White vs. non-White; foreign vs. native, etc.).

Monolingual Exclusivity and Worldliness

The NSL is the locus of monolingual identity, both collectively and individually. Within this one-nation-one-language-one-culture-one-self view, bilingual and multilingual identities are seen as threats to the unitary structures of language, nation, culture, and self. In response to the undeniable existence of linguistic and cultural diversity, the monolingual exclusivity of the standard positively values bilingualism only in terms of what Heller (1999) has called "parallel bilingualisms", that is, where speakers will ideally move from one monolingual standard norm to another, with none of the practices of variation (such as language mixing or codeswitching) that have been so abundantly documented in actual bilingual discourse, particularly in minority language situations. For FL professionals and society at large, "the preferred route to

bilingualism is that of a monolingual speaker of an L1 learning the L2 from zero as an adult, and the ideal goal is eventually to be able to 'pass for' a monolingual speaker of the learned language" (Ortega 1999b, p. 249).[6] The FL classroom is often an ideologically monolingual space in which only the target language is supposed to be used (e.g., a leave-your-English-at-the-door stance) and students will be discouraged from using their L1 (through disapproval, poor grades, and even punishment). Bilingual dictionaries, a fundamental component of FL pedagogy, provide a condensed codification of the lexicon of the two standard languages. Cognates represent the authorized zone of interference between the languages but language mixing is not encouraged. The standard-to-standard move is ideally to be accompanied by the corresponding shift in identity as the student assumes the appropriate cultural norms, generally based on a highly stereotyped view of the native (i.e., foreign) target culture of the idealized native speaker.

These attitudes are prevalent in ideologically monolingual nations, such as France, the United States, and Mexico, where the NSL construct is an important element in citizenship, national identity, and increasingly in global identity. Ideologized monolingualism is linked to the notion of standard language as world language with its assumption of communicative efficiency. Standardness is assumed to impart clarity and efficiency to an utterance as well as bestow membership to speakers in a global community organized around communicative efficiency (see Cameron 2002).

Rethinking Language and Culture Beyond the Native Standard

Attempts to grapple with the ideologized homogeneity of the native standard language-culture in FL education have called for greater inclusion of sociolinguistic variation and cultural diversity. However, variation is generally conceptualized as a "problem" with respect to the unitary assumptions of the native standard language. This section will explore some of the directions that have been proposed for providing a more sociolinguistically and socioculturally complex view of "the language" of FL learning and teaching.

From Variation as Problem to Variation as Resource: Towards a Notion of Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicompetent Expertise

Valdman (1982, 1992, 2000, and this volume) has advocated the incorporation of variation in FL pedagogy by means of the notion of pedagogical norm, a necessarily partial description of the language for the

purposes of teaching, but one firmly grounded in the observable language practices and attitudes of native speakers, as well as to a certain learnability on the part of non-native speakers.[7] The central notion is one of "managing" (*gérer*) variation, rather than eliminating it, through a principled selection of variants to be codified in a pedagogical norm. This position offers a well-formulated riposte to the notion that the native standard language (e.g., standard French) is the only appropriate model for a teachable language and that the inclusion of sociolinguistic variation into the pedagogical object results in "confusion" for the learner, as well as being instructionally "impractical".

A critical approach, which also is compatible with the notion of pedagogical norm, poses the native standard as the problem and recommends the incorporation of variation as a means of managing the problematic native standard. To pastiche Ruíz' (1988) often-quoted language-as-problem/language-as-resource distinction, variation must be seen as a resource for FL education, not as a problem. The "problem" of sociolinguistic variation posed by the native standard language becomes a constellation of sociocultural issues surrounding identity and involving problematic concepts of nativeness in relation to otherness, foreign-ness and non-nativeness.

The concept of pedagogical norm acknowledges the learner's individual experience as a non-native speaker with respect to the native standard, the pedagogical language of the classroom, linguistic variation among "native" speakers of the L2, and the learner's own inevitable departure (canonically described in terms of "error") from all of the preceding language practices. This learner-oriented view is in stark distinction to the native standard language model that tends to support asymmetrical power relations between the authoritative expert native or near-native speaker and the inexpert and subordinated nonnative student-learner. The culture of standardization surrounding the native standard language enters into conflict with learner-centered pedagogies, where learning and teaching concentrate on negotiation between learners and instructors (e.g., Breen 1984) rather than on the imposition of authority and authorized knowledge. Increasingly, learner-centeredness recognizes the empowering and, in critical pedagogical terms, the transformative potential of giving students the tools, the place, and the time to assume more involved and self-directed roles in the process of language learning (Tudor 1996).[8]

Questioning native standard language expertise from the learner's perspective has coincided with valuing the non-native teacher (Medgyes 1992) in second-language education. Rampton (1990) offers "language expertise" as an alternative term to "native speaker".[9] Expertise, explains Rampton, is fairer to both learners and teachers in

that using native-speaker competence to set targets and define proficiency leaves the learner "playing a game in which the goal-posts are being perpetually moved by people they cannot often challenge" (p. 99). Expertise, on the other hand, draws attention to the body of knowledge that defines expertise rather than on the person of the expert (i.e., the teacher), such that the notion of expert shifts the emphasis from "who you are" to "what you know" (p. 99). In the context of the monolingual exclusivity of ESL classrooms, Auerbach (1993) questions the "native-speaker fallacy" (p. 25) that privileges native speakers as superior to non-native teachers solely on the basis of knowledge of the target language. Challenging native speaker expertise, notes Auerbach, requires reconceptualizing the notion of expertise in order to legitimate the knowledge and experience of nontraditional experts from the learners' communities.[10]

In FL education, the expertise of the non-native teacher and student resides in their experience as bilingual or multilingual language learners. Cook (1999) argues that going beyond the native speaker is mostly a matter of "adjusting the perspectives about models that underlie language teaching" (p. 204). Language teaching, in Cook's view, should place more emphasis on the actual production of L2 users rather than on an idealized and, arguably, unattainable native speaker model of "the language". Language learning and teaching, then, requires a new attitudinal stance toward language on the part of learners and teachers such that L2 users will be seen, and see themselves, as "successful multicompetent speakers, not failed native speakers" (p.204). Preston's (1989) notion of "competent bilingual" represents another alternative model to the native standard language for the language learner. Rather than attempting to assimilate or accommodate to the native speaker model, competent bilinguals have constructed "efficient but divergent systems for themselves" (p. 83) and are able to maintain effective linguistic integration into the L2 speech community without succumbing to the subtractive assimilation associated with the loss of an earlier linguistic or cultural heritage (p. 85).

For heritage language learners, the questioning of native speaker expertise addresses issues of inclusion, equity and fairness, particularly in terms of greater inclusion of and tolerance for the language practices of bilingual speakers that may not conform to the native standard language (e.g., Spanish). Ortega (1999a) calls for rethinking foreign language education by questioning the elitism attached to the native standard model and realizing the potential of minority students' contribution to a "notion of foreign languages as a resource for all." A critical rethinking of this nature recognizes the value of bilingual students in FL classrooms in ways that can lead to the improvement of FL

instruction by sensitizing educators to the needs of bilinguals in FL classrooms and thus fostering greater involvement and motivation among English monolinguals as well as bilingual students. For example, language minority students (e.g., Spanish speakers) can provide English-speaking majority students with enhanced opportunities for language interaction and can create "cultural and linguistic bridges" to communities in the United States (Ortega 1999a, p. 31).

Reimagining FL Education as Cross-Cultural, Multicultural, and Sociocultural Education

While FL instruction seems like the obvious arena for a multilingual and multicultural approach to education, the pedagogical construct of the language has remained mired in the ideology and practice of standardization. The "reality" constructed, reflected, and imposed by the NSL model is that multilingualism and multiculturalism in the FL education is all too often confined to a multiplicity of world standard languages (English, French, Spanish, etc.) rather than more broadly defined notions of language and culture. Accepting "the language" as anything other than standard not only calls into question many of the assumptions educators and learners have concerning what constitutes a language, as well as its instruction and learning, but also raises sociocultural issues surrounding speakers' identity (in individual and collective terms) and their inclusion in (or exclusion from) a given community.

The sociolinguistic issues of monolingualism, bilingualism and multilingualism surrounding the NSL require discussions about multiculturalism in opposition to monoculturalism, "difference" in contrast to "deficit" (see Labov 1972), and diversity versus unity. The question that emerges is "difference from what?" Difference in FL education remains a vague concept that has been relatively poorly defined in terms of the ideologies and sociocultural practices that construct and reflect that difference. The construct of NSL is the ideological "what" that defines difference in many situations.

FL education appeals to the notions of "difference," "diversity" and "multiculturalism" attached to the native standard construct prevalent in American schools and society at large. The native standard language is consistent with the dominant assimilationist ideology: one universal culture and language in which the school's role is to enculturate individual students into that culture and socialize them with the skills needed for success within that culture (La Belle and Ward 1994, p. 25). The myth of the native speaker as the ideal target of FL education is linked to the traditional definition of multiculturalism that seems to include only cultures outside the United States,

while marginalizing American immigrant or indigenous language communities (Ortega 1999a). This is supported by the fact that FL programs in higher education place a great emphasis on study abroad experience (Freed 1995) and FL textbooks have traditionally focused on the mainstream culture of the target-language countries, such as Spain and Mexico, with little or no reference to minority linguistic communities in the United States where Spanish is spoken (Ramírez and Hall 1990). The non-standard language practices of these problematically native communities are often stigmatized in FL classrooms resulting in the labeling of some learners as "inadequate" or "underdeveloped" with respect to the idealized native standard speaker norm (Wilberschied and Dassier 1995; Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci 1998).

The sociocultural implications of sociolinguistic variation have only begun to be discussed in FL pedagogy using a variety of metaphors and in ways that question the dominant ideologies and practices attached to the NSL. Otherness and difference have been framed in terms of border crossing (inspired by Anzaldúa 1987) and language crossing (drawing on Rampton 1995). The metaphor of linguistic travel and migration reconceptualizes the language of bilingual and multilingual speakers in ways that lessen the hegemony of the privileged native speaker through a redefinition and re-appropriation of the term as the "privilege of the non-native speaker" (Kramsch 1997).

Breaking down the bounded native/non-native opposition is basic to the cross-cultural approaches that require educators and learners alike, as von Hoene (1999) proposes, to re-imagine departments of foreign languages and literatures as "sites of cross-cultural difference." Culture crossing is intended to challenge the notion of native standard language-culture as it is realized in foreign language pedagogy's "model of mimesis and assimilation" (p. 26) wherein the subject (i.e. the learner) takes on one culture and discards another. Difference means distancing oneself from the native speaker model that supports one of the unconscious but operative desires of the foreign language classroom: the desire to identify with and to "pass" as the other.

The notion of the "intercultural speaker" (Kramsch 1998a) problematizes the dual nativeness (L1-L2 and C1-C2) imposed by the native standard language-culture model and internalized by speakers. In rejecting the binary logic of modernity associated with the native standard language-culture, intercultural learners inhabit a "critical third place" (Kramsch 1993; also see Lo Bianco et al. 1999) where language study is an initiation into a kind of social practice that is at the boundary of two or more cultures and languages. The metaphor of a third place follows in a rich vein of anthropological and philosophical

concern for alterity and its application to educational matters (see Serres 1991).

Exploring the metaphor of the FL classroom as multicultural speech community, Blyth (1995) calls for the foreign-language teaching profession to confront the monolingual ideology of the native standard language and to recognize the "multilingual reality" of students:

> Students are likely to find foreign language courses increasingly irrelevant and anachronistic unless teachers can find ways to address the growing cultural and linguistic diversity inside and outside their classrooms. It is time to "reimagine" our classroom communities. It is time to see students as they are—as multilingual nonnative speakers—and to encourage in them the unique linguistic adaptability that is the hallmark of multilingualism (Blyth 1995, p. 174).

The focus on FL learners' practices as human beings with complex identities in the world challenges the reality constructed through the NSL. In contrast to most current practices of multicultural education that presume an essentializing configuration of identity based on the idea of the Enlightenment subject (Hall 1992),[11] Dolby (2000) finds that identity and difference in the lives of students are constituted not through essentialized and naturalized categories, but instead through practices that have the potential for constant reformation. According to data collected during a one-year ethnographic study of a multiracial high school, students "rewrite" the conventional concept of difference reified in institutionalized identities of race, class and gender (Dolby 2000, p. 905). By recognizing that difference is necessary for the realization of community and identity, critical multiculturalism challenges the "assimilationist multiculturalism" grounded in "the normative liberal culture" that seeks to dissolve difference in the interest of unity within the educational community and beyond (Alemán 2001).

If problematic concepts of identity and difference such as race can be rewritten by students, why not language? Evidence suggests a "dialectic between language and identity" (Ogulnick 2000) where notions of identity are reshaped through language in ways that do not conform to the expected identities attached to native speakers (see Rampton 1995). The metaphor of rewriting the codified and institutionalized native standard language offers tantalizing possibilities for making FL classrooms privileged places in the educational system where nonnative speakers are challenged to reconceptualize the dominant notions of language and culture both in the "native" and "foreign" contexts. The pervasive nature of standardization, as arguably the dominant linguistic ideology in the world, provides abundant content for critical reflection. In diachronic perspective, national standard

languages can be contextualized through lessons on the history of the language that do not portray French or Spanish (or other languages) as the glorious culmination and "triumph" of national or international language-cultures. Instead, language must be redefined as a set of complex sociocultural and sociolinguistic phenomena (e.g., bilingualism, language mixing, linguistic ideologies) related to the construction of highly problematic unitary identities (e.g., nation, class, race, Francophonie, Hispanidad). In synchronic terms, the rewriting of language has the potential to draw learners and teachers into content discussions and projects on variation (bilingualism, multilingualism, register, dialectology, etc.) and standardization as a means of situating FL education within local and global contexts abroad and at home.

Creating a Place for Critical Awareness of Language, Culture and Self in FL Education

Rethinking, reimagining, reconceptualizing and rewriting the (non)native standard language demands the incorporation of critical language awareness (CLA) into the FL curriculum and teacher education. I will outline some pedagogical orientations and some practical suggestions for creating an explicit place for CLA (as sociolinguistic, sociocultural, sociohistorical, political, and affective awareness) in FL education as part of a larger critical multicultural and intercultural education.

Language awareness encompasses a wide range of the metalinguistic knowledge and attitudinal stances toward practices of variation. In the last twenty years, the terms "language awareness", "knowledge about language" have come to designate efforts by educators and applied linguists to bring conscious attention to properties of language and language use as a significant element in education (Fairclough 1992, p. 2). Underlying the language awareness and knowledge about language movements is the question of what role the native standard or hyperstandard language plays or should play in pedagogical contexts. Exploring the interplay between identity, normativity and variability in language learning and teaching is fundamentally a process of developing awareness of language, culture, and self.

In FL pedagogy, metalinguistic attention has always been present: from the traditional highly normative focus on (in)correct forms to more recent focus-on-form (FonF), to use Long's (1991) distinction, where accuracy is situated in the context of appropriate and meaningful uses of a putative native speaker norm. Taking the role of metalinguistic knowledge a step further, Valdman (2000) has formulated a

compelling argument for an "enlightened normativism" that avoids both the anything-goes-as-long-as-students-are-communicating approach to variation and the traditional focus on forms.[12] By questioning the validity of the idealized native speaker norm, this perspective has brought an explicit focus on sociolinguistic variation into the discussion that had been lacking in the FonF movement. Nevertheless, issues arising from the relationship between variation and normativity (in sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, sociocultural, sociocognitive, affective, pedagogical, and political terms) are far from being resolved in FL education. The basic questions of what constitutes appropriateness (based on whose native speech practices? in which contexts?) and how it is related to the (in)correctness and (in)accuracy attached to the native standard language are very much on the table.

The field of Critical Language Awareness (CLA) marks an attempt to problematize the notions of accuracy and "appropriateness" based on native-speaker norms that reflect only the language practices of a dominant group in society. Fairclough (1992), for example, observes that the theory and language of "appropriateness" coexists within a historically earlier and overtly normative model of variation based on the "correctness" of the standard language. For Fairclough, language awareness in the classroom tends to be uncritical (e.g., Hawkins 1984) because it admonishes students to become aware of their language production in order not to deviate from the standard. A critical awareness of language, then, attempts to situate appropriateness within its historical and ideological context of the native standard. CLA is ultimately a process of creating more inclusive conceptions and practices of language and culture.

The goals of language awareness have been generally linked to the speaker's level of linguistic knowledge and proficiency. For example, language awareness programs and activities are typically different for instructors (assumed to have native or near-native speaker proficiency and knowledge of the language) than for heritage language learners (assumed to have more than a beginning level of oral proficiency and linguistic knowledge, with varying degrees of proficiency in writing), than for non-native learners ranging from beginning (assumed to have limited proficiency and knowledge of the language) to advanced levels. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that there is a scaffolding of language awareness over time as linguistic knowledge and proficiency develop in individual learners through interaction with more expert speakers in a variety of situations. However, as I will discuss, it is a mistake to suppose that explicit language awareness activities are only valuable for the most proficient speakers (i.e., advanced learners, heritage learners and instructors). Whether explicitly directed at

students of various levels or at instructors (with an implied positive washback effect on students), critical language awareness projects offer the opportunity for:

1. the exploration (and ultimately the transformation) of speakers' individual and collective beliefs (ideologies, attitudes, biases, prejudices) surrounding language;
2. an appreciation of variation as inherent in language and learning;
3. the questioning of dominant linguistic and cultural knowledge (e.g., native standard language) and how it is constructed and represented;
4. critical reflection on the tension and interplay that exist in language education between creative individual uses of language and conformity to institutionalized norms; and,
5. insight into the sociocultural construction of speakers' identities and "realities" in a multilingual and multicultural world.

Towards Critical Language Awareness for Students

CLA calls for creating a place for the exploration of beliefs and experiences concerning language that all students bring with them from the first moment they set foot in class. While beginning students are not yet knowledgeable in the target language (TL), they all bring with them rich linguistic and sociocultural knowledge as speakers of at least one language. This learner-centeredness (Tudor 1996) is consistent with the tenets of constructivist approaches to learning and teaching that recognize the knowledge that students have, even if it is not that which typically constitutes school knowledge, such as practices of variation attached to non-native speakership.

CLA endeavors to tap into the fundamental experience of multilingualism in the United States within an ideologically monolingual society. In a variety of forms, this is the experience that all students and teachers bring with them to the language classroom. It can be said that there is no one in any region or city of the United States, who has not been touched by the complex historical and on-going process of immigration with its attendant sociolinguistic processes (language acquisition, language loss, language attitudes, etc.). In many parts of the United States, this basic multilingualism is very much part of the students' everyday lives as speakers of languages other than English or as English monolinguals who come into contact with speakers of other

languages and non-standard varieties of English. In less diverse areas, the relevancy of multilingualism may take the form of students' family histories. Discussion topics can involve questions such as: What has been your family's experience(s) with language? How do you think that your experience is different from or similar to that of recent immigrants to the United States? Activities treating these issue can involve research and interpretive projects (e.g., "Write the sociolinguistic (auto)biography of your family, or someone else's family, using genealogical data and/or oral interviews with family and with recent immigrants") or more creative formats ("This is how I imagine my grandmother felt when she came to America from..."). These projects can serve as a springboard for lively discussion and reflection on important issues of language and culture.

Radio broadcasts are a rich source of sociolinguistically complex texts that can be used in the FL classroom, even at the beginning level.[13] Villegas Rogers and Medley (2001), for example, present several listening comprehension activities designed to increase students' aural comprehension of Spanish and their awareness of the diversity of Spanish, particularly with respect to the bilingual speech norms found in the United States. In one activity (p. 435), after a brief prelistening activity in which students are asked about different types of information given on the radio, students listen to three different oral texts (e.g., weather and traffic reports, news, commercials) from selected Spanish language radio broadcasts in the United States targeting bilingual audiences. Students are asked to identify each type of text (e.g., "I think that text #1 is a weather report because I heard the word *temperatura*"). Working from a transcript of the oral texts, students prepare a list of English phrases and words, as well as any Spanish cognates, both real (e. g., *comentar* = comment; *yarda*, a loan word from English in place of standard *césped*, *grama*, *prado*, *patio*, etc.) and false (e.g., *aplicar*, a calque formed on English "apply" instead of the standard *solicitar*). This activity provides students with the opportunity to appreciate the lexical richness of Spanish and the communicative value of regional or bilingual variations. Similar activities can be developed using contact varieties of French from Quebec and from hexagonal French texts featuring Anglicisms.

Reflections on contact varieties and bilingual norms reveal important connections between English as a world colonial language (official language of former British colonies, global lingua franca) and French and Spanish as world languages. In beginning classes, canonical projects on linguistic diversity in the Francophone or Hispanophone world can be refocused from the fact that French or Spanish is spoken in a given region or nation, to ask why (standardization, colonization) and

how it is spoken there. A critical reframing of the construct of French or Spanish as a world standard language serves to highlight the multilingual context of Spanish and French in the putatively "Spanish-speaking" or "French-speaking" regions of the world (see Mar-Molinero 1997; Ball 1997; Stewart 1999). In what ways is multilingual Peru or Spain a Spanish-speaking nation? How does "French" fit into Canadian or African multilingualism on individual and societal levels?

At the intermediate and advanced levels, students should be exposed and sensitized to variation through genre-based exploration of a variety of oral and written texts. As with all critical language awareness activities, the goal is not to seek-and-correct nonstandard features, but rather to develop an appreciation of variation as inherent in language and learning. With increased language proficiency, advanced and intermediate learners can explore the creation of identities on the margins of native speakership through first-person narratives written by bilingual and multilingual speakers in the TL, a substantial body of which can be found in French (Francophone authors as well as bilinguals in the Hexagon) and Spanish (peninsular regional writers, indigenous Americans, North American Latino authors). Students can be encouraged to creatively play with non-native speech genres in specified contexts. Along these lines, Belz (2002, this volume) devised an experimental activity for students in an advanced FL (German, in this case) course at a North American university in which they were asked to write a brief (300- to 500-word) multilingual text in the target language (TL) and another language or languages. The students were also asked to create a personalized language name (e.g., "Engleutsch") for their new linguistic abilities since beginning their study of the TL. The students' learning experience, Belz found, was enhanced by an increasing awareness of their growing multicompetence, a new state of mind brought about by the learning of another language:

> [the students] conceptualize themselves as multicompetent language users with respect to all languages they know as opposed to deficient L2 communicators with respect to only their L2(s). Moreover, learning German is not viewed as the mere addition of another language to their prior linguistic abilities (see V. Cook, 1992, p. 565); instead, their developing knowledge of German interfaces with their knowledge of English (and other languages), creating new and unique languages and, consequently, prideful and pleasurable reflective modes of expression (Belz 2002, p. 32).

Validating students' awareness as multicompetent speakers challenges the additive/subtractive dichotomy surrounding the native standard

language construct. Foreign language learning becomes more than adding the TL standard to the putatively native standard English. In a very profound way, the quality of the educational experience is not defined solely in terms of accuracy and fluency defined by native speaker norms.

From Critical Language Awareness to Critical Language Teaching Awareness

At present, most of the projects to enhance critical awareness of sociolinguistic diversity in FL education have focused on the most knowledgeable and proficient speakers, that is, instructors and teachers, but with the ultimate goal of transforming these educators' attitudes and practices in relation to the variable production of their students. Critical language awareness must be seen as the basis for critical language teaching awareness (see van Lier 1996 and Gebhard & Oprandy 1999 for excellent discussions of language awareness in teacher education and language teaching awareness, respectively).

The goals of critical language awareness and language teaching awareness can be advanced by integrating an applied linguistic and/or sociolinguistic component into TA training and teacher education programs (see Stubbs 1982 for a particularly ambitious sociolinguistics course). Kramsch (2000, p. 322), for example, suggests that traditional teaching methods courses (e.g., basic information on pedagogic methods and activities) could be supplemented by a course on Critical Applied Linguistics (see Pennycook 2001) regarding national language policies and institutional practices. Such a course would contextualize the study of FL's by making students aware of the political and historical context in which these languages have been codified and standardized (see Pennycook 1998, Train 2000), as well as situate the study of standard national languages within the current debates surrounding feminist and postcolonial theory in cultural studies. This course would guide students toward an awareness of the political context of FL study in the United States, such as the link between FL study and patterns of immigration and English dominance.

Discussion of linguistic diversity and inclusion in the FL classroom raises a number of vital questions concerning the role of critical language awareness for educators as a means of questioning the native standard language model. Pérez-Leroux and Glass (2000) present an "inclusive model of foreign language instruction" in distinction to "standard-based models," which select a single regional norm that is then taught to the exclusion of others. Language programs, under an inclusive model, try to expose students to "the richness and variety of the various regional and social norms of the target language" (p. 60).

It is suggested that classroom teachers, program directors and curriculum designers can avoid mistaking issues of language policy (e.g., pedagogical practices that promote a particular dialectal variety) for issues of accuracy in student performance in the target language. The inclusive model addresses basic questions voiced by instructors surrounding how to embrace diversity while enforcing classroom standards. If no one language variety is better than another, does that mean that there are no standards to uphold in the classroom? What is the role of the teacher in the linguistically diverse foreign language classroom? In response, it is acknowledged that the textbook may serve as the "local standard" that defines accuracy in a given language program. The teacher's role is to enhance the richness of language that students are exposed to in the classroom and to promote discussion on language and dialects in order to raise students' and teacher's "linguistic sensitivity" and improve understanding of "linguistic biases." Moreover, the instructor "may educate students about the different varieties of the foreign language and give them freedom to choose which one to identify with" (p. 60).

In order to begin creating sociolinguistically inclusive classrooms, language instructors must confront the ideologies, biases, and assumptions surrounding the native standard model. Pérez-Leroux and Glass (2000) have developed linguistic awareness activities for instructor training designed to increase awareness of linguistic diversity, to challenge the subtractive view of linguistic diversity, and to answer the typical concerns that the inclusive model elicits among instructors. Workshop facilitators present sociolinguistic definitions of language ("Language permits communication...") and dialect ("Everyone speaks a dialect...") leading instructors to realize that linguistic hierarchization is a sociopolitical issue rather than a linguistic measure of a variety's communicative or cognitive value. Reflection and knowledge of this critical sort allows instructors to begin challenging the dominant notion of a-language-as-a-standard-language and the attendant linguistic discrimination based on the devalorization of practices of variation.

The inclusive model opens avenues of reflection that lead to a deepened discussion of the native standard language, standardization and their defining relationship to diversity. Relativizing the authority of the textbook as a local norm does not resolve the question of how or to what extent the textbook reflects a particular norm. Given that codification of the local standard in the textbook implies standardization, it would be useful to explicitly examine how the textbook norm is socially and linguistically situated with respect to language practices existing outside that norm. Awareness activities, then, should also

prepare instructors to critically reflect on pedagogical materials by learning to question the standardized linguistic and cultural knowledge represented in textbooks (see Walz 1980; Kramsch 1987; Ramírez & Hall 1990; Wieczorek 1994). In a series of vignettes adapted from real-life situations, Pérez-Leroux and Glass (2000) create a context in which instructors must confront familiar language biases that may produce conflict in Spanish departments. The following activity forces instructors to critically evaluate the hyperstandard language of the textbook in the light of their personal sociolinguistic knowledge:

> Read the vignette, then respond to the question(s) raised after the vignettes. You should take notes and be prepared to share with the rest of the class.
>
> > A TA encounters a rule in a language textbook that explicitly says the use of indicative mood in a particular type of sentence is "incorrect." The instructor, a native speaker, is used to speaking that way.
>
> What should the instructor tell students about this discrepancy? Should he alter his language to conform to the text? (Pérez-Leroux and Glass 2000, p. 62)

Rather than uncritically accept the authority of the text, TAs can be guided towards a critical awareness of their own linguistic production and of the textbook standard. In this case, the TA can learn to situate his linguistic practices (as a native speaker of X variety, or a bilingual speaker who speaks like this because...) with respect to other varieties of Spanish and the pedagogical norm represented in the text. TAs can be encouraged to recognize and exploit discrepancies between the hyperstandard of the text and their own sociolinguistic knowledge as valuable teachable moments to increase their students' awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity. But that does not imply that the TA must resort to the common practice of "verbal hygiene" (Cameron 1995) by which he would completely sanitize his classroom language to conform to the hyperstandardized language of the textbook.[14]

It is a significant step to acknowledge that teachers can use their own dialect, rather than conform to a single native-speaker ideal or variety. However, the assumption remains unchanged: that the teacher's language and the students' production will conform to a defined native-speaker dialect. If that is the case, then who decides what conforms or not and who defines what constitutes a legitimate dialect and what is a non-native idiolect? Is bilingual speech, code-switching and language mixing, for example, acceptable? Why or why not? In exposing students to a variety of possible linguistic identities, it is necessary to ask whether these are stereotyped national, regional, class, gender,

or racial identities, as well as how they are related to various native speaker norms. Moreover, questions arise as to the types of linguistic and cultural identity, or identities, students are allowed or encouraged to create. Is, for example, a *Chilango* identity considered appropriate or inappropriate for a Spanish class? Or a *Parigot* identity in a French course? Should students be encouraged to create non-native identities? If so, then what are workable non-native identities and how are they related to dominant native standard speaker norms?

This sort of critical discussion, reflection and awareness is relevant to preparing FL educators to address linguistic biases surrounding notions of nativeness, non-nativeness, and near-nativeness in the construction of professional identities. Not all native speech practices (e.g., Canadian or African varieties of French, regional varieties of hexagonal French; a given national or regional Spanish) fall into the acceptable native standard speaker category considered appropriate for a worthy foreign language professor. The situation becomes even more complex when one takes into account the often marginalized position of ethnic-language, or heritage-language, speakers in departments of foreign language (see Valdés 1998; Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci 1998). Such American-born members of immigrant families have typically developed their linguistic practices in the non-standard varieties associated with bilingualism and informal contexts of use. Spanish speakers of Mexican American and Puerto Rican backgrounds as well as francophones from northern New England and Louisiana are often considered undesirable in many foreign language departments because they supposedly speak the wrong kind of language, and their class backgrounds clash directly with those of faculty members who were raised in foreign countries (Valdés 1998, p. 154).

Along with native speakership, "near-native proficiency" is a stated criterion for employment on virtually all job announcements for foreign language faculty. However, there is a general haziness as to what constitutes the notion of near-native proficiency and its representative speaker (Valdés 1998; Koike and Liskin-Gasparro 1999). The ultimate attainment of proficiency by the FL language learner is seen in terms of near-native speakers who have mastered a sort of hyperstandard language allowing them to function effectively within the boundaries of an academic and pedagogical discourse characterized by stereotyped notions of (in)correctness and (non)nativeness.[15] Judgments about a given candidate's linguistic abilities are largely impressionistic in that each professor on the search committee carries different criteria of native and near-native-speaker proficiency. Two faculty members may come to a fundamental disagreement as to the fluency and accuracy of a particular candidate (Valdés 1998, p. 157).

Moreover, it has been shown that a lack of consensus exists between the notion of near-native proficiency described by non-native graduate students in Spanish and that held by hiring committees (Koike and Liskin-Gasparro 1999). In light of the characteristic inequality, (in)security and (in)correctness associated with the standard language, it is not surprising that graduate students have been found to suffer from a "sense of insecurity over whether they are 'near-native enough'" (Koike and Liskin-Gasparro 1999, p. 59).

Graduate-student training in FL departments would do well to situate the insecurity of graduate students and, it must be assumed, FL educators in general within the context of a critical perspective on the standardness of academic and pedagogical discourse. A comprehensive training program should prepare future educators for the realities and the ideologies attached to the standard language, such as linguistic (in)security and (in)correctness, that the students will encounter throughout their professional lives. Critical language teaching awareness would counterbalance the dominant insecurity among language educators by presenting the perspective, supported by Medgyes' (1996) observations, that nonnative speakership also confers on teachers a deep sense of empathy with their students and a profound understanding of the useful learner strategies and the fundamental difficulties that are a part of learning another language.

Ultimately, the goal of critical language teaching awareness is to create an institutional space in which to explore and cultivate professional identities for educators that transcend the "native", "near-native" and "non-native" categories. For example, graduate students could design a research project, focusing on one element of the research agenda suggested by Valdés (1998, p. 156), in which they conduct a survey of near-native foreign language professionals (taken from the wide range of lecturers, professors, TAs, or secondary-level teachers) asking about their experiences as nonnative speakers in the profession, their perspectives on the standard of near-native ability, and their views concerning the legitimacy or the necessity of the construct. Apprentice and experienced instructors should be provided with the opportunity to expand their awareness of self through the exploration of (non)nativeness and near-nativeness, as in the following (socio)linguistic autobiography activity adapted from Koike & Liskin-Gasparro (1999, p. 62):

> Personal narrative simultaneously is born out of experience and gives shape to experience. In this sense, narrative and self are inseparable. Self is here broadly understood to be an unfolding reflective awareness of "being-in-the-world," including a sense of one's past and future. We

> come to know ourselves as we use narrative to apprehend experiences and navigate relationships with others (Ochs, Elinor, and Lisa Capps. 1996. "Narrating the Self" Annual Review of Anthropology 25: 19–43).
>
> Please tell the story of your "relationship" with language in the form of an autobiography. How did you come to be a speaker of the languages you speak? In particular, how is your X [French, Spanish, etc.]-speakership related to English and any other language you may have learned? Please write freely, and reflect on the significance of linguistic events in your life rather than simply record them.

Action research projects in the classroom on the use of bilingual communicative strategies, such as code-switching, would permit FL educators to better understand, appreciate, and utilize their unique knowledge and expertise as bilingual, multilingual, even interlingual, speakers (see Chavez, this volume, for such an example of action research). In a recent study exploring the quantity and functional use of L1 (English) by student teachers in French FL classrooms, Macaro (2001) reminds us that no study so far has been able to demonstrate a causal relationship between exclusion of the L1 and improved learning. Therefore, educationalists and practitioners should avoid claims for the "effectiveness of L2 exclusivity" in classrooms where learners share the same L1 (p. 545). However, the suggestion of even the most principled use of English in French class would seem to violate the widely held view among instructors and students in the exclusivity of L2 use in the classroom, an attitude that is consistent with the ideologized monolingualism of the native standard speaker. Educators should become critically aware of their assumptions regarding monolingual exclusivity and explore what Macaro calls the "optimality" for the use of codeswitching by the teacher: when, how and to what ends can native, non-native and near-native teachers most effectively deploy their bilingual or multilingual expertise in the FL classroom?

Perhaps the most basic, most sensitive, and most intractable issue for educators is that of (in)correctness and (in)accuracy. Critical language teaching awareness must address issues of language policy and issues of accuracy in student performance. An understanding of standardization recognizes that accuracy within an institutionalized pedagogical setting is very much embedded in the politics of language education which influence teacher affect and identity. Consistent with a critical perspective on standardization, Valdés (1999) suggests that the entire concept of native-like correctness needs to be examined in the framework of critical language study. But this critical pedagogy, where language teaching is a contested site, will not be simple since language ideologies are deeply instilled in most of us:

> It is easier to expand the canon and to speak of multiculturalism than to examine and combat our beliefs and emotions surrounding language correctness. Language is what we do as professionals and ultimately it is who we are (p. 47).

For example, Valdés (1999) identifies a certain "language bigotry" that is alive and well in English literature and composition classrooms in colleges and universities in the United States. Instructors routinely question the language skills of non-native speakers, including the problematically (non)native speakers of the non-prestige varieties associated with Spanish-English bilingualism. The discourse practices of many of these speakers are stigmatized as "imperfect". While FL instructors obviously have considerable experience in working with students with varying levels of proficiency in the target language, the fear of turning out "an imperfect product" (Valdés 1999), where perfection and quality equate the native standard language speaker, is no less an issue.

From a critical standpoint, the affective dimension of (in)correctness and (in)accuracy as a component in the identity of language professionals and students does not exist in isolation from larger issues of selection, elitism and inequality in society and education. What goes on in the classroom and in the minds of educators and students cannot be totally dissociated from what Sacks (1999) has called "meritocracy's crooked yardstick" by which increasingly standardized forms of assessment and curriculum benefit an elite group while punishing others. A heightened awareness of the tenets of standardization is an important step in allowing FL educators to participate in the fundamental debates over the shape and role of language and culture in schooling.

Conclusion: Socioculturality as the Core

Language teaching is never and can never be only that, to use Byram's (1998, p. 114) playful and insightful phrase. The inclusion of a greater variety of sociolinguistic input in FL classrooms goes hand in hand with the inclusion of cultural diversity that valorizes bilingual, multilingual, and interlingual perspectives, thus positioning "culture as the core" (Lange et al. 1998) of FL education. The difficult issues raised by a critical awareness of the native standard language offer opportunities for repositioning the object of FL learning and teaching in terms of perspectives that recognize socioculturality as the core.

The sociocultural turn in FL pedagogy and SLA research (see Lantolf 2000) complements critical pedagogy and awareness projects. From a critical sociolinguistic and sociocultural vantage point, "the

language" (French, Spanish, etc.) of FL classrooms is a sociocultural artifact produced by standardization. This perspective focuses attention to the critical awareness of the standard language with respect to institutionalized structures, cultural assumptions, and internalized attitudes about language, self, and society. For language-culture learners and educators, the native standard language as a sociocultural phenomenon must be seen in terms of second culture acquisition (Lantolf 1999) "because what is at stake is the way minds, selves, and worlds are (re)organized and (re)constructed" (p. 45).

Rather than viewing standardization as an immutable cultural given, critical awareness offers a much-needed perspective from which teachers and students may question the reality and validity of the native standard language construct. A critical perspective on standardization is consistent with interdisciplinary projects to situate foreign languages in their sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and discursive contexts, such as Swaffar's (1999) redefinition of the FL profession as "a master humanist discipline" whose territory already has been mapped around the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*:

> Our discipline's goal, therefore, is to enable students to do things with words and to recover what has been done with words, socially, historically, politically, and interpersonally (Swaffar 1999, p. 158).

Yet there seems to be an uneasy silence in the National Foreign Language Standards with respect to the native standard language construct (Train 2002), which has not been explicitly addressed in either the Standards or the discussions surrounding them (see Philips and Terry 1999).

Language teachers need to consider how awareness and attitude are important dimensions of foreign language work. A component of intercultural competence (Fantini 1999) is a Freirean (Freire 1970) sense of awareness as critical consciousness (*concientização*) as the most important task of education. Awareness, then, is always self-awareness that involves exploring, experimenting, and experiencing. But awareness of selfhood is also critically contextualized in a social situation and, therefore, potentially transformative of the self and of one's relation to others, and leads to dealing critically and creatively with reality and fantasy (Fantini 1999, pp. 184–185).

Critical language awareness is at the same time what Kramsch (1998b) has called "social awareness across cultures". From this perspective, standardization must be seen as a powerful sociocultural force that shapes, arguably distorts, the varying "discourse worlds" (Edmondson 1985) of both FL learners and the putatively native speakers in the collective and individual construction of meaning, or

in Kramsch's words, culture "dialogically created through language in discourse" (1998b, p. 27). This view challenges the native standard speaker model in a profound way:

> Our purpose in teaching culture through language is not to make our students into little French or little Germans, but in making them understand why the speakers of two different languages act and react the way they do, whether in fictional texts or in social encounters, and what the consequences of these insights may mean for the learner.
>
> We can ask learners to temporarily play a role that is not theirs, think thoughts that they don't usually think. Ultimately, however, they will have to decide how they wish to shape this culture of the third kind, that is neither the one they grew up with, nor the one they are invited to enter. Social awareness goes hand in hand with social responsibility both vis-à-vis others and vis-à-vis oneself (Kramsch 1998b, p. 27).

Social responsibility then does not necessarily mean accepting uncritically the dominant ideology of the native standard language. Social awareness and responsibility also imply a whole range of affective and cultural stances on the part of learners and educators with respect to these constructs. It must be assumed that there is the full spectrum of responses to the unitary constructs of language and culture, ranging anywhere from oppositional identities, to acquiescence, to enthusiastic assimilation to the dominant norms—within a single classroom, even within a single learner over a lifetime. A critical culture of the FL classroom grounded in awareness is necessarily learner-centered in that accurate forms, appropriate uses, appropriate identities, standardized goals and outcomes must respect, rather than merely seek to control the variable nature of the language-culture acquisition process from one learner to the next.

Notes

1. Contributions from diverse research traditions (including sociolinguistics, anthropology, sociology, education, and cultural theory) have problematized the notion of the idealized native standard speaker (see Bakhtin 1981; Valdman 1982; Milroy and Milroy 1985; Crowley 1989, 1990; Medgyes 1992; Lodge 1993; Rampton 1990, 1995; Blyth 1995; Wiley and Luke 1996; Kramsch 1997; Silverstein 1996; Dasgupta 1998; Ortega 1999b; Valdés 1998, 1999; Milroy 2001).
2. Romaine succinctly sums up this view:

> Standardization is not an inherent, but rather an acquired or deliberately and artificially imposed characteristic. Standard languages do not arise via a "natural" course of linguistic evolution or suddenly spring into existence. They are created by conscious and deliberate planning. (Romaine 1994, p. 84)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to the Haugen's (1966) widely-used terminology (also see Preston 1989, Lodge 1993), this complex sociolinguistic process involves the acceptance of a norm that is selected from a diversity of varieties, codified into a formal unitary construct (i.e., "the French language," "the Spanish language") and elaborated to fulfill a variety of social functions, including education.

3. The ideological role of standard languages in the creation of modern national communities (i.e., nation-states) has been well documented, particularly by applied sociolinguists (e.g., Garvin and Mathiot 1968, Haugen 1966, Stewart 1968) working in the field of language planning. More recently, research on standardization (Milroy and Milroy 1985; Joseph 1987; Crowley 1989; Lodge 1993) has taken a more critical, post-modern stance toward the ideological premise of national unity and the socioeconomic and political construct that Etienne Balibar (2001) has named *la forme nation*.

4. Davies (1991) presents a very thoughtful restatement of this dominant ideology in acknowledging that although the "flesh and blood" existence of the native speaker is a myth, it is "a useful myth" (p. 167) insofar as "for learners of second languages the native speaker must represent a model and a goal" (p. 165). In order to make such a claim, the distinction must be drawn between the idealized native speaker (i.e., the myth) and the sociocultural "reality" of the native speaker as a component in "all majority-minority power relations", such that

> ...we define minorities negatively against majorities which themselves we may not be able to define. To be a native speaker means not being a non-native speaker. (Davies 1991, pp. 166–67)

5. The appraisal by learners of the second-language learning situation with its limited range of stimuli may be related to affective stances (i.e., based on appraisal of stimuli) toward language learning and student motivation to acquire the language (see Schumann 1999). Given the contrast between the variability in students' learnings styles and the relative invariability of the hyperstandard, one can speculate as to whether "the language" of the foreign language class adversely affects student motivation to or interest in learning the language. If FL enrollment statistics are any indication of learner interest, then it would seem that for most learners, and would-be learners, the unfortunate reaction to the foreign language is to avoid learning it by never electing to take a foreign language or limiting their exposure to the minimum requirements or, in some cases, by engaging in a form of active resistance such as "not-learning", to use Kohl's (1991) apt expression. Although I know of no research to support a direct causal link between the hyperstandard language of the foreign language class and limited student enrollments, the fact remains that in 1990 only about 6% of American public high school students took more than 2 years of a foreign language before graduation (Draper 1991).

6. This view of bilingualism is part of a general devalorization of immigrant perspectives and, by extension bilingualism in terms of "subtractive

assimiliation" (Cummins 1984) in the broader educational context of "subtractive schooling" of minority language speakers (Valenzuela 1999). The assimilationist stance of the native standard language has also been linked to its officialization through legislative and administrative acts (e.g., French as French national language, "English Only" movement in the United States) (Lo Bianco 1999). Standardization is usually a prerequisite or a result of officialization (Kloss 1986). Standardization acts upon the choice of language (i. e., the native standard) and also posits the exclusivity of that language. As Wiley and Lukes (1996) note, the standard language ideology positions speakers of different varieties of the same language within a social hierarchy, while the complementary linguistic ideology of English monolingualism frames policy issues in an "immigrant paradigm in order to portray language diversity as an alien and divisive force" (p. 511). These linguistic ideologies are connected to other social ideologies related to individualism and social mobility through education (Wiley and Lukes 1996).

7. For Valdman, the pedagogical norm should be codified according to three series of criteria, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic (or *acquisitionnels*), and sociopsychological (or *épilinguistiques*). The sociolinguistic criteria require the pedagogical norm to reflect the actual, observable, and "variable production of *targeted* native speakers in authentic communicative situations" (Valdman 1992, p. 84). On the psycholinguistic level of language acquisition, the pedagogical norm should incorporate the variants that are the easiest to acquire at any given stage in the acquisition process. In sociopsychological terms, the variants selected for the pedagogical norm should take into account the attitudes of the target linguistic community. It is assumed, for example, that native speakers would be shocked by the deletion of the negative morpheme *ne* by the non-native learner who is assumed to have learned French in a formal instructional setting (Valdman 2000). The pedagogical norm would foster the ability to reflect on the attitudes and expectations of learners and native speakers about language. It is assumed that awareness on the part of students for native speaker attitudes toward given variants would be guided by the notion of linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1982) by which the learning of the target language will be more profitable when it leads to the appropriation by the learner of the linguistic varieties most valued by the members of the targeted linguistic community (Valdman 2000).

8. The concept of "relational knowing" (Gallego, Hollingsworth, and Whitenack 2001) provides a way to view students' and educators' relations with others as reflections of the larger cultures of which they are members, as well as opportunities to reconstruct those cultures through the educational reform.

9. Rejecting the essentialism of nativeness, Rampton asserts that expertise has the following significant advantages over nativeness as metaphor for considering language proficiency:

1. Experts do not have to feel close to, or identify with, what they know a lot about.
2. Expertise is learned, not fixed or innate.
3. Expertise is relative. One person's expert is another person's fool.
4. Expertise is partial. People can be expert in several fields, but they are never omniscient.
5. Expertise is achieved through a process of certification, in which the expert is judged by other people using standards of assessment that can be reviewed, disputed, or challenged. There is a healthy tradition of challenging the 'experts' (1990, p. 99).

10. In the case of ESL, teachers who are nonnative speakers of English may possess qualifications that the native speakers may not, such as insight into the experience of acquiring the second language and the experience as a newcomer to the United States, in addition to specialized teacher training. Auerbach recounts a situation where having actually lived these realities enabled an immigrant teacher to tap into what was meaningful and significant for immigrant students and make connections that were otherwise not possible for the native speaker teacher:

> For example, I once spent many hours struggling to elicit discussion about housing issues from a class of Haitian learners while one of my students, a Central American undergraduate with considerably less "professional knowledge," was able, with seeming ease, to instantly ignite animated discussion of the same topic just by sharing an anecdote from her own life dealing with an exploitative landlord. Her lived experience was more powerful than my expertise in unlocking the doors to communicative interaction (Auerbach 1993, p. 26).

11. According to this paradigm, groups (divided by race, ethnicity, class, or other categories and designated as distinct and separate) are assumed to have an identity formed through "some authentic common origin or structure of experience" (Grossberg 1994) and to possess characteristics that are understood as inherent (though not necessarily biological). Finding one's "authentic" self, or the core of one's identity, is a central preoccupation both inside and outside the classroom (Dolby 2000, p. 899).

12. Valdman (2000) characterizes *normativisme éclairé* as a tolerant but realistic attitude toward linguistic variation in the face of the reality imposed by the linguistic ideology of the native standard. This moderate position implies a certain professional responsibility on the part of FL educators to acknowledge the stigmatization by dominant groups of non-standard variants, which means that pedagogical norms must conform, at least to some degree, to the sociocultural realities imposed by the ideology of the native standard.

13. Particularly in beginning level classes, it is useful to keep in mind the important distinction between the active vocabulary (or output) and the receptive ability of students to understand a variety (see Liceras, Carballo, & Droege 1994–95). Exposing students to practices of variation does not imply that students must be able to produce every lexical item or syntactic structure that they encounter in authentic speech.

14. In their study of the Spanish program at a Canadian university, Liceras, Carballo, and Droege (1994–95) found that 78% of native speaker professors report using a "variedad estándar general" that eliminates the specific traits of the professor's regional or national variety (p. 301).

15. Based on survey data from 28 colleges and universities, Koike and Liskin-Gasparro (1999) conclude that the typical search committee seeks a candidate who fits the following profile of near-native speakership:

> someone who speaks fluent, virtually error-free Spanish with good-to-excellent pronunciation and no marked foreign or regional accent and who would have no trouble lecturing and leading discussions exclusively in Spanish (p. 59).

Works Cited

Alemán, Ana M. Martinez. 2001. Community, Higher Education and the Challenge of Multiculturalism. *Teachers College Record* 103:485–503.

Anderson, Benedict R. 1991. [1983]. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London: Verso.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Meztiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Auerbach, Elsa Roberts. 1993. Reexamining English Only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27: 9–32.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balibar, Etienne. 2001. *Nous, citoyens d'Europe? Les frontières, l'Etat, le peuple*. Paris: La Découverte.

Ball, Rodney. 1997. *The French Speaking World: A Practical Introduction to Sociolinguistic Issues*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bartsch, Renate. 1987. *Norms of Language: Theoretical and Practical Aspects*. London and New York: Longman.

Bauer, Laurie, and Peter Trudgill, eds. 1998. *Language Myths*. London and New York: Penguin.

Belz, Julie A. 2002. Second Language Play as a Representation of the Multicompetent Self in Foreign Language Study. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 1: 13–39.

Blyth, Carl. 1995. Redefining the Boundaries of Language Use: The Foreign Language Classroom as a Multilingual Speech Community. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 145–183. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Ce que parler veut dire: l'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris: Fayard.

Breen, M. P. 1984. Process Syllabuses for the Language Classroom. In *General English Syllabus Design*, edited by C. J. Brumfit, ELT Documents 118. Oxford: Pergamon.

Byram, Michael. 1998. Cultural Identities in Multilingual Classrooms. *In Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*, edited by Jasone Cenoz, and Fred Genesee, 96–116. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, Michael, and G. Zarate. 1997. Definitions, Objectives and Assessment of Sociocultural Competence. In *Sociocultural Competence in Language Learning and Teaching*, edited by M. Byram, G. Zarate, and G. Neuner. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London and New York: Routledge.

———. 2002. Globalization and the Teaching of "Communication Skills." In *Globalization and Language Teaching*, edited by David Block and Deborah Cameron, 67–82. London and New York: Routledge.

Cook, Vivian. 1992. Evidence for Multicompetence. *Language Learning* 42: 557–591.

———. 1999. Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33: 185–210.

Crowley, Tony. 1989. *Standard English and The Politics of Language*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

———. 1990. That Obscure Object of Desire: A Science of Language. In *Ideologies of Language*, edited by John E. Joseph, and Talbot J. Taylor, 27–50. London: Routledge.

Cummins, Jim. 1984. *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dasgupta, Probal. 1998. The Native Speaker: A Short History. In *The Native Speaker: Multilingual Perspectives*, edited by Rajendra Singh, 182–192. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Davies, Alan. 1991. *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dolby, Nadine. 2000. Changing Selves: Multicultural Education and the Challenge of New Identities. *Teachers College Record* 102: 898–912.

Draper, Jamie B. 1991. *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1989 and Fall 1990*. Yonkers, New York: ACTFL.

Edmondson, W. 1985. Discourse Worlds in the Classroom and in Foreign Language Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7: 159–168.

Eloy, Jean-Michel, ed. 1995. *La qualité de la langue? Le cas du français*. Paris: Champion.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. The Appropriacy of 'Appropriateness.' In *Critical Language Awareness*, edited by Norman Fairclough, 33–56. London and New York: Longman.

Fantini, Alvino E. 1999. Comparisons: Towards the Development of Intercultural Competence. In *Foreign Language Standards: Linking Research, Theories, and Practices*, edited by Phillips, June K., and Robert M. Terry, 165–218. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Freed, Barbara F., ed. 1995. *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

Gallego, Margaret A., Sandra Hollingsworth, and David A. Whitenack. 2001. Relational Knowing in the Reform of Educational Cultures. *Teachers College Record* 103: 240–266.

Garvin, Paul L., and Madeleine Mathiot. 1968 [1956]. The Urbanization of the Guaraní Language: A Problem in Language and Culture. In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, 365–374. The Hague: Mouton.

Gebhard, Jerry, and Robert Oprandy. 1999. *Language Teaching Awareness: A Guide to Exploring Beliefs and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1975. *Quaderni del carcere.*, vol. 3. Turin: Einaudi.

Grossberg, Lawrence. 1994. Introduction: Bringin' it all back home: Pedagogy and Cultural Studies. In *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*, edited by H Giroux, and P. McLaren, 1–25. New York: Routledge.

Hall, Stuart. 1992. The Question of Cultural Identity. *In Modernity and its Futures*, edited by S. Hall, D. Held, and T. McGrew, 273–325. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. Dialect, Language, Nation. *American Anthropologist* 68: 922–935.

Hawkins, Eric. 1984. *Awareness of Language: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica. 1999. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. New York: Longman.

Joseph, John E. 1987. *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*. London: Pinter.

Kloss, Heinz. 1986. On Some Terminological Problems in Interlingual Sociolinguistics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 57: 91–106.

Kohl, Herbert. 1991. *I Won't Learn from You! The Role of Assent in Education*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Koike, Dale A., and Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro. 1999. What is a Near-Native Speaker? Perspectives of Job Seekers and Search Committees in Spanish. *ADFL Bulletin* 30: 54–62.

Kramsch, Claire. 1987. Foreign Language Textbook Construction of Foreign Reality. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 44: 95–119.

———. 1993. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1997. The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. *PMLA* 112: 359–369.

———. 1998a. The Privilege of the Intercultural Speaker. In *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approaches Through Drama and Ethnography*, edited by Michael Byram, and Michael Flemming, 16–31. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1998b. Teaching Language along the Cultural Faultline. In *Culture as the Core: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Culture Teaching and Learning in the Language Curriculum.*, edited by Dale L. Lange, Carol A. Klee, R. Michael Paige, and Yelena A. Yershova. 15–31. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

———. 2000. Second Language Acquisition, Applied Linguistics, and the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *The Modern Language Journal* 84: 311–326.

La Belle, Thomas J., and Christopher R. Ward. 1994. *Multiculturalism and Education: Diversity and Its Impact on Schools and Society*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Labov, William. 1972. [1969]. The Logic of Nonstandard English. In *Language and Social Context*, edited by Pier Paolo Giglioli, 179–215. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lange, Dale L., Carol A. Klee, R. Michael Paige, and Yelena A. Yershova, eds. 1998. *Culture as the Core: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Culture Teaching and Learning in the Language Curriculum*. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Lantolf, James P. 1999. Second Culture Acquisition: Cognitive Considerations. In *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by Eli Hinkel, 28–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. **ed.** 2000. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Liceras, Juana M., Alicia Carballo, and Sonja Droege. 1994-95. El tema de las variedades del español en los programas de español como lengua extranjera. *Revista de Filología Románica* 11–12: 291–308.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 1999. The Language of Policy: What Sort of Policy Making is the Officialization of English in the United States. In *Sociopolitical Perspectives on Language Policy and Planning in the USA*, edited by Thom Huebner, and Kathryn A. Davis, 39–65. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lo Bianco, Joseph, Anthony J. Liddicoat, and Chantal Crozet, eds. 1999. *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education*. Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.

Lodge, R. Anthony. 1993. *French: From Dialect to Standard*. New York: Routledge.

Long, Michael H. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*, edited by K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Macaro, Ernesto. 2001. Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85: 531–548.

Mar-Molinero, Clare. 1997. *The Spanish-Speaking World: A Practical Introduction to Sociolinguistic Issues*. London and New York: Routledge.

McGroarty, Mary. 1996. Language Attitudes, Motivation, and Standards. In *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*, edited by Sandra Lee McKay, and Nancy H. Hornberger, 3–46. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Medgyes, Peter. 1992. Native or Non-native? Who's Worth More? *ELT Journal* 46: 340–349.

———. 1996. *The Non-native Teacher*. London: Macmillan.

Milroy, James. 2001. Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5: 530–555.

Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1991 [1985]. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London: Routledge.

Ogulnick, Karen L., ed. 2000. *Language Crossings: Negotiating the Self in a Multi-cultural World*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Ortega, Lourdes. 1999a. Rethinking Foreign Language Education: Political Dimensions of the Profession. In *Foreign Language Teaching and Language Minority Education*, edited by K. A. Davis, 21–39. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

———. 1999b. Language and Equality: Ideological and Structural Constraints in Foreign Language Education in the U.S. In *Sociopolitical Perspectives on Language Policy and Planning in the USA. Studies in Bilingualism*, edited by Thom Huebner, and Kathryn A. Davis, 243–66. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pennycook, Alastair. 1998. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

———. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pérez-Leroux, Ana T., and William R. Glass. 2000. Linguistic Diversity and Inclusion in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 33: 58–62.

Phillips, June K., and Robert M. Terry, eds. 1999. *Foreign Language Standards: Linking Research, Theories, and Practices*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Preston, Dennis R. 1989. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1998. They Speak Really Bad English Down South and in New York City. In *Language Myths*, edited by Laurie Bauer, and Peter Trudgill, 139–49. New York: Penguin.

Ramirez, Arnulfo G., and J.K. Hall. 1990. Language and Culture in Secondary Level Spanish Textbooks. *Modern Language Journal* 74: 48–65.

Rampton, M. B. H. 1990. Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, Affiliation and Inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44: 338–43.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London and New York: Longman.

Rogers, Carmen Villegas and Frank W. Medley, Jr. 2001. U.S. Spanish on the Air: Good Waves for the Classroom? *Foreign Language Annals* 34: 426–438.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ruíz, Richard. 1988. Orientations in Language Planning. In *Language Diversity, Problem or Resource? A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States*, edited by Sandra Lee McKay, and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, 3–25. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Sacks, Peter. 1999. *Standardized Minds: The High Price of America's Testing Culture and What We Can Do to Change It*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Schumann, John H. 1999. A Neurobiological Perspective on Affect and Methodology in Second Language Learning. In *Affect in Language Learning*, edited by Jane Arnold, 28–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serres, Michel. 1991. *Le Tiers-Instruit*. Paris: François Bourin.

Silverstein, Michael. 1996. Monoglot "standard" in America. In *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by Donald Brenneis and Ronald Macaulay, 284–306. Boulder: Westview.

Stewart, Miranda. 1999. *The Spanish Language Today*. London and New York: Routledge.

Stewart, William A. 1968. A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualism. In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, edited by Joshua Fishman, 531–545. The Hague: Mouton.

Stubbs, Michael. 1982. What is English—Modern English Language in the Curriculum. In *Linguistics and the Teacher*, edited by Ronald Carter, 137–155. London: Routledge.

Swaffar, Janet. 1999. The Case for Foreign Languages as a Discipline. *ADFL Bulletin* 30: 6–12.

Train, Robert W. 2000. Getting Past the Ideology of "The Language": The Standardization of French and Spanish, and Its Implications in Foreign-language Pedagogy. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley.

———. 2002. Foreign Language Standards, Standard Language and the Culture of Standardization: Some Implications for Foreign Language and Heritage Language Education. Paper presented at the First UC Language Consortium Conference on Language Learning and Teaching, University of California, Irvine. <http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/hli/papers.htm>

Tudor, Ian. 1996. *Learner-centredness as Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Valdés, Guadalupe. 1998. The Construct of the Near-Native Speaker in the Foreign Language Profession: Perspectives on Ideologies about Language. *Profession 1998*: 151–160.

———. 1999. Nonnative English Speakers: Language Bigotry in English Mainstream Classrooms. *ADFL Bulletin* 31/1: 43–48.

Valdés, Guadalupe, and Michelle Geoffrion-Vinci. 1998. Chicano Spanish: The Problem of the "Underdeveloped" Code in Bilingual Repertoires. *The Modern Language Journal* 82/4: 473–501.

Valdman, Albert. 1982. Français standard et français populaire: Sociolectes ou fiction? *The French Review* 56/2: 218–227.

———. 1992. Authenticity, Variation, and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom. *In Text and Context Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, and S. McConnell-Ginet, 79–97. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

———. 2000. Comment gérer la variation dans l'enseignement du français langue étrangère aux Etats-Unis. *The French Review* 73/4: 648–666.

Valenzuela, Angela. 1999. *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

van Lier, Leo. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy & Authenticity*. London and New York: Longman.

von Hoene, Linda M. 1999. Imagining Otherwise: Rethinking Departments of Foreign Languages and Literatures as Departments of Cross-Cultural Difference. *ADFL Bulletin* 30: 26–29.

Walz, Joel. 1980. Colonialistic Attitudes Toward the French-Speaking World in American Textbooks. *Contemporary French Civilization* 5: 87–104.

Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov, and Marvin I. Herzog. 1968. Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change. In *Directions for Historical Linguistics: A Symposium*, edited by W. P. Lehmann, and Y. Malkiel, 96–195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wieczorek, Joseph A. 1994. The Concept of "French" in Foreign Language Texts. *Foreign Language Annals* 27: 487–497.

Wilberschied, L., and J. L. P. Dassier. 1995. Increasing the Number of Minority FL Educators: Local Action to Meet a National Imperative. *The Modern Language Journal* 79: 1–14.

Wiley, Terrence G., and Marguerite Lukes. 1996. English-Only and Standard English Ideologies in the U. S. *TESOL Quarterly* 30: 511–535.

FL027870

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

BLANKET

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction	
Author(s): Magnan, Sally Sieloff	
Corporate Source: Heinle / Thomson Learning	Publication Date: 11/14/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Sean Ketchem, editor
Organization/Address: Heinle, 25 Thomson Place, Boston, MA 02210	Telephone: 617-289-7720 FAX: 617-289-7851
	E-Mail Address: sean.ketchem@heinle.com Date: 9/30/03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	Heinle / Thomson Learning
Address:	25 Thomson Place Boston, MA 02210
Price:	$25.00

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)